

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. Applicant appreciates the indication that claim 3 contains allowable subject matter.

By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 13, 21-23, 27 and 28 are amended for clarity and/or to recite additional features disclosed in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0053] and [0054]. Claim 3 is also amended to be consistent with the amendments made to claim 1.

The title is amended, as the Examiner requested, to be more descriptive of the claimed subject matter.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks Examiner Dinh for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representative, Mr. Luo, during the December 19, 2007 personal interview. The substance of the personal interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge receipt of the certified copy of the priority document filed November 18, 2003.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-19 and 21-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,996,535 to Ono et al.; and rejects claims 7 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ono in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,801,962 to Taniguchi et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Ono discloses all elements recited in claim 1. In particular, the Office Action asserts that Ono discloses checking for coincidence between received status of trading information including e-mail with previously stored information, referring to Figs. 3 and 4; col. 5, lines 9-63; and col. 7, lines 9-36 of Ono. Thus, the Office Action asserts that Ono discloses the recited first determination system that determines whether an e-mail address corresponds with a predetermined e-mail address.

However, this portion of Ono merely discloses checking for correspondence between received and stored status of trading information. Although the trading information may include e-mail, what is checked is the status, not the e-mail. Specifically, Ono appears to disclose checking a received trading identifier against stored identifiers so as to determine whether there is a match between the received trading identifier with any of the stored trading identifier. See col. 5, lines 34-37. Thus, what is matched is an identifier. Ono does not disclose or suggest a match between e-mail addresses. Thus, Ono does not disclose the first determination system recited in claim 1.

Also, regarding claim 1, even if Ono discloses matching a received e-mail address against stored e-mail addresses, Ono does not disclose matching a received e-mail address against the e-mail address of client 210 in Fig. 1, because the stored e-mail addresses, if disclosed in Ono, are not the e-mail address of client 210.

The Office Action also asserts that Ono discloses selecting and transmitting orders, citing Ono at col. 6, lines 2-42. Thus, the Office Action asserts that Ono discloses the second determination system recited in claim 1 that determines whether an e-mail message is directed to an electronic device. However, this portion of Ono only appears to disclose transmitting orders based on trading information. This portion does not disclose or suggest anything related to determining whether the e-mail message is directed to the electronic device to which the second determination system belongs. Specifically, this portion of Ono only appears to disclose determining sending orders to a destination other than the client 210, but does not disclose a determination whether the order is directed to the client 210 itself. Thus, this portion does not disclose or suggest the second determination system recited in claim 1.

To expedite prosecution, claims 1, 13, 21-23, 27 and 28 are amended to recite additional features, as outlined above. In particular, these claims are amended to recite "a

predetermined common e-mail address." The applied references, Ono and Taniguchi, clearly do not disclose or suggest this additional feature recited in the claims.

For at least the above reasons, Ono and Taniguchi, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 13, 21-23, 27 and 28, and the claims depending therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-28 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo  
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/aps

Date: PROPOSED

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--